

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8-14 and 16-23 are pending. Claims 1-6, 8-14 and 16-23 are amended herein. No new matter is added by the claim amendments.

Response to Examiner's Arguments

On page 2 of the instant Office Action, the Examiner states that this application is not a continuation-in-part (CIP) of Canova et al. ("Canova;" U.S. Patent No. 6,961,029). However, Applicants respectfully note, when the present application was filed on November 27, 2000, the application was identified as a CIP and the filing papers included a priority claim to the aforementioned patent application. The declarations filed with the CIP application also included a priority claim to the aforementioned patent application. The filing papers including declarations are a matter of record. The specification is amended herein to clarify this item.

Other items raised in the Examiner's arguments are addressed below.

Claim Objections

The claims are amended to correct the informalities noted in the Office Action.

102 Rejections

Claims 1, 10 and 18 versus Yuki et al.

According to the instant Office Action, Claims 1, 10 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Yuki et al. ("Yuki;" U.S. Patent No. 5,805,149). The Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and

respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention recited in Claims 1, 10 and 18 are not shown or suggested by Yuki.

According to independent Claim 1, a display unit includes a display panel that includes "a fixed, active pixel border region ... permanently dedicated to displaying a border attribute, wherein said fixed, active pixel border region surrounds said rectangular pixel frame buffer region on four sides of said rectangular frame buffer region and comprises a width in the range of two to 128 pixels."

According to independent Claim 10, a display unit includes a display panel that includes "a fixed, active pixel border region ... permanently dedicated to displaying a border attribute, wherein said fixed, active pixel border region surrounds said rectangular pixel frame buffer region on four sides of said rectangular frame buffer region including top, bottom, right and left border regions, wherein said fixed, active pixel border region comprises a width in the range of two to ten pixels."

According to independent Claim 18, a handheld device includes a display panel that includes "a fixed, active pixel border region ... permanently dedicated to displaying a border attribute, wherein said fixed, active pixel border region surrounds said rectangular pixel frame buffer region and comprises a width in the range of two to five pixels."

Yuki appears to show only a border display portion 502 that measures at least 280x312 pixels (see Figure 3b of Yuki) in width. The border display portion of Yuki is thus more than 128 pixels in width.

According to page 3 of the Office Action, Figure 2b of Yuki teaches a border region of 32 pixels. However, in contrast to the claims, the border region in Yuki's Figure 2b lies on only two sides of the display.

According to page 3 of the Office Action, Yuki teaches that the image region can be differently sized and that if the display is increased in size, then Yuki's border region would decrease in size. Applicants respectfully note, according to the claims, the border region is "a fixed, active pixel border region ... permanently dedicated to displaying a border attribute." That is, the claimed border region can only display a border attribute. In contrast to the claims, Yuki's border region includes pixels that can be used for display purposes. In other words, the instant Office Action includes an example in which, if Yuki's display is increased to 1022x1022 pixels, then the border region would have a width of two pixels. However, if Yuki's border had a width that was within the claimed range, then Yuki's border would include pixels that are not permanently dedicated to displaying a border attribute.

Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that Yuki does not show or suggest "a fixed, active pixel border region comprising pixels permanently dedicated to displaying a border attribute, wherein said fixed, active pixel border region surrounds said rectangular pixel frame buffer region on four sides of said

rectangular pixel frame buffer region and comprises a width in the range of two to 128 pixels” (or 2-10 pixels or 2-5 pixels) as recited in Claims 1, 10 and 18.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Yuki does not show or suggest the limitations of independent Claims 1, 10 and 18. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the basis for rejecting Claims 1, 10 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is traversed and that Claims 1, 10 and 18 are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 10 and 18 versus Canova

According to the instant Office Action, Claims 1, 10 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Canova.

The instant application is a continuation-in-part of Canova (the “parent application”). The limitations of Claims 1, 10 and 18 are fully supported by the parent application and thus these limitations have the effective filing date of the parent application (that is, for the purposes of the claim limitations just mentioned, the instant application and Canova have the same filing date). Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Canova does not qualify as prior art. The Examiner is respectfully directed to MPEP § 706.02(V)(B).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the basis for rejecting Claims 1, 10 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is traversed and that Claims 1, 10 and 18 are in condition for allowance.

103 Rejections

Claim 1

According to the instant Office Action, Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Matsuzaki et al. ("Matsuzaki;" U.S. Patent No. 6,140,992) in view of Kim et al. ("Kim;" U.S. Patent No. 5,355,443), Singla et al. ("Singla;" U.S. Patent No. 6,597,373) and Dinwiddie et al. ("Dinwiddie;" U.S. Patent No. 6,195,078). The Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention recited in Claim 1 are not shown or suggested by Matsuzaki, Kim, Singla and Dinwiddie, alone or in combination.

As presented above, independent Claim 1 recites a fixed, active pixel border region that is less than 128 pixels in width. Matsuzaki appears to show only a border that measures at least 128x128 pixels (see Figure 6 of Matsuzaki – the vertical border is $[1280 \text{ minus } 1024]/2 \text{ equals } 128 \text{ pixels}$, and the horizontal border is $[1024 \text{ minus } 768]/2 \text{ equals } 128 \text{ pixels}$). The border display portion of Matsuzaki is not less than 128 pixels in width. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that Matsuzaki does not show or suggest a fixed, active pixel border region that is less than 128 pixels in width as recited in Claim 1.

According to page 3 of the Office Action, Matsuzaki's Figure 6 shows a border region having a width of 56 pixels. Applicants are unable to identify such a border region in Matsuzaki. Applicants respectfully request clarification with regard to how the value of 56 pixels was determined.

Applicants further submit that neither Kim nor Singla nor Dinwiddie overcomes the shortcoming of Matsuzaki. Neither Kim nor Dinwiddie appears to show a fixed, active pixel border region as claimed. Singla describes a border region 106 (Figure 2) that has a width of $[X_DISPLAY (1024 \text{ pixels}) \text{ minus } X_IMAGE (640 \text{ pixels})]/2$, which equals 192 pixels, or $[Y_DISPLAY (768 \text{ pixels}) \text{ minus } Y_IMAGE (480 \text{ pixels})]/2$, which equals 144 pixels; see column 3, lines 1-6, of Singla. Thus, the minimum width described by Singla does not appear to be less than 128 pixels in width as recited in Claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Matsuzaki, Kim, Singla and Dinwiddie, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the limitations of Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the basis for rejecting Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed and that Claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Claims 2-4 and 8

According to the instant Office Action, Claims 2-4 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Matsuzaki in view of Kim, Yuki, Ogawa (U.S. Patent No. 6,018,331), Singla and Dinwiddie. The Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention recited in Claims 2-4 and 8 are not shown or suggested by Matsuzaki, Kim, Yuki, Ogawa, Singla and Dinwiddie, alone or in combination.

Claims 2-4 and 8 are dependent on Claim 1 and recite additional limitations. Hence, by demonstrating that the limitations of Claim 1 are not shown or suggested by the cited references, it is also demonstrated that the

limitations of Claims 2-4 and 8 are not shown or suggested by the cited references.

As presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Matsuzaki, Kim, Singla and Dinwiddie, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the limitations of Claim 1.

Applicants further submit that neither Yuki nor Ogawa overcome the shortcomings of Matsuzaki, Kim, Singla and Dinwiddie. Yuki is discussed above. Ogawa appears to show only a border that measures at least 212x240 dots (see Figure 2A of Ogawa, for example – the vertical border is $[1280 \text{ minus } 800]/2$, which equals 240 dots, and the horizontal border is $[1024 \text{ minus } 600]/2$, which equals 212 dots).

Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Matsuzaki, Kim, Yuki, Ogawa, Singla and Dinwiddie, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the limitations of Claim 1 and that Claim 1 is allowable over these references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Matsuzaki, Kim, Yuki, Ogawa, Singla and Dinwiddie, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the limitations of each of Claims 2-4 and 8 in combination with the limitations of Claim 1. As such, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 2-4 and 8 are allowable over the cited references. Consequently, Applicants respectfully assert that the basis for rejecting Claims 2-4 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed.

Claims 5-6 and 9

According to the instant Office Action, Claims 5-6 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Matsuzaki in view of Kim, Yuki, Singla and Dinwiddie. The Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention recited in Claims 5-6 and 9 are not shown or suggested by Matsuzaki, Kim, Yuki, Singla and Dinwiddie, alone or in combination.

Claims 5-6 and 9 are dependent on Claim 1 and recite additional limitations. Hence, by demonstrating that the limitations of Claim 1 are not shown or suggested by the cited references, it is also demonstrated that the limitations of Claims 5-6 and 9 are not shown or suggested by the cited references.

As presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Matsuzaki, Kim, Singla and Dinwiddie, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the limitations of Claim 1. Furthermore, for the reasons presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that Yuki does not overcome the shortcomings of Matsuzaki, Kim, Singla and Dinwiddie.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Matsuzaki, Kim, Yuki, Singla and Dinwiddie, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the limitations of Claim 1 and that Claim 1 is allowable over these references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Matsuzaki, Kim, Yuki, Singla and Dinwiddie, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the limitations of each of Claims 5-6 and 9 in combination with the limitations of Claim 1. As such, Applicants

respectfully assert that Claims 5-6 and 9 are allowable over the cited references. Consequently, Applicants respectfully assert that the basis for rejecting Claims 5-6 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed.

Claims 10-14 and 16-17

According to the instant Office Action, Claims 10-14 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Matsuzaki in view of Kim, Ogawa, Singla and Dinwiddie. The Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention recited in Claims 10-14 and 16-17 are not shown or suggested by Matsuzaki, Kim, Ogawa, Singla and Dinwiddie, alone or in combination.

As presented above, independent Claim 10 recites a fixed, active pixel border region that is less than 10 pixels in width. Claims 11-14 and 16-17 are dependent on Claim 10 and recite additional limitations.

Also as presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Matsuzaki nor Kim nor Ogawa nor Singla nor Dinwiddie shows or suggests a fixed, active pixel border region that is less than 10 pixels.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Matsuzaki, Kim, Ogawa, Singla and Dinwiddie, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the limitations of Claim 10 and that Claim 10 is allowable over these references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Matsuzaki, Kim, Ogawa, Singla and Dinwiddie, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the limitations of each of Claims 11-14 and 16-17 in combination with the limitations of Claim 10.

As such, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 11-14 and 16-17 are allowable over the cited references. Consequently, Applicants respectfully assert that the basis for rejecting Claims 10-14 and 16-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed.

Claims 18-23

According to the instant Office Action, Claims 18-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Matsuzaki in view of Kim, Yuki, Ogawa, Singla, Dinwiddie and He et al. ("He;" U.S. Patent No. 6,323,849). The Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention recited in Claims 18-23 are not shown or suggested by Matsuzaki, Kim, Yuki, Ogawa, Singla, Dinwiddie and He, alone or in combination.

As presented above, independent Claim 18 recites a fixed, active pixel border region that is less than 5 pixels in width. Claims 19-23 are dependent on Claim 18 and recite additional limitations.

As presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Matsuzaki nor Kim nor Yuki nor Ogawa nor Singla nor Dinwiddie shows or suggests a fixed, active pixel border region that is less than 5 pixels in width. Applicants further submit that He does not overcome the shortcoming of these references. He does not appear to show a fixed, active pixel border region as claimed.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Matsuzaki, Kim, Yuki, Ogawa, Singla, Dinwiddie and He, alone or in combination, do not show or

suggest the limitations of Claim 18 and that Claim 18 is allowable over these references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Matsuzaki, Kim, Yuki, Ogawa, Singla, Dinwiddie and He, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the limitations of each of Claims 19-23 in combination with the limitations of Claim 18. As such, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 19-23 are allowable over the cited references. Consequently, Applicants respectfully assert that the basis for rejecting Claims 18-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed.

Conclusions

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of Claims 1-6, 8-14 and 16-23. Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-6, 8-14 and 16-23 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Date: 10/29/07

Respectfully submitted,

MURABITO HAO & BARNES LLP



William A. Zarbis
Reg. No. 46,120

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113

(408) 938-9060